Sabbath Observers and the Punishment of Dissidents: African Leaders and the Western Battle for International Dominance

Blessing Simura* and Kudzaishe Marecha**

Abstract *: Liberation leaders in Africa rose due to the promise of freedom and emancipation not only politically but economically. However, given the fact that independence in most states was acquired not through the barrel of the gun, Africa only attained political independence. Any attempt to change the economic status-quo was met with wroth from the erstwhile colonial masters as well as international institutions. Leaders who tried to push for economic emancipation where/are attacked with all the ammunition at the disposal and their economies are made to scream in order to scare others from such an act. The paper argues most African leaders, given the above scenario, tried to please the Western leaders more at the expense of the African peoples. The Western leaders have always continued to be driven by the desire to maintain their hegemony in international affairs and have to do anything that would make them retain the power. Due to the fact that such power is sometimes attained through the use of military invasion, other smaller states have decided to amass deterrent weapons to protect themselves. The paper notes that this has brought the world into an era of 'Realist Interdependence'. The paper concludes by analyzing the nature of the concept of the 'International Community' and concludes that while the concept should be inclusive, currently its meaning and application is selective and exclusionary in favour of the Western states.*

* M.Sc. International Relations Student, Department of International Relations, University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe, simble_23@yahoo.com.
** Research Fellow, Department of Political and Administrative Studies, University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe.

Introduction

The coming of independence to Africa beginning in 1954 with the independence of Ghana was greeted with hope by many Africans who saw in the new dispensation opportunities for development on their own pace. The promise of independence during the liberation struggles in Africa, in their different forms, was not merely limited to political independence. Independence was postulated as inclusive, capturing both the economic and political aspects. This is clearly articulated by the preindependence promises made by the leaders of struggles. These promises included the land reform in countries like Zimbabwe and Kenya while the African National Congress (ANC) in South Africa had a Freedom Charter which summarised all the changes that were to be made at the attainment of majority rule.

However, at the turn of independence, most of the promises were not fulfilled. The African cause was seen as a lost cause. Development remained a pipe dream for most African countries. At most, many African countries attained the flag and anthem independence without the corresponding economic benefits. Those who benefited from colonialism remained the most privileged in the society casting questions of the sincerity of the leaders to the aspirations of the majority. Many brutal regimes retained the colonial draconian laws and used to entrench them in power. Nicodimanian agreements were signed with the Western powers to keep them in control of economic pillars in exchange for the support of regimes. These leaders, once termed terrorists became darlings of the former colonial masters. The calls by the African independence prophets like Amilcar Cabral were lost.

Former colonial masters worked to prop their 'allies' and used subtle ways to remove leaders who were seen as threats to the national interest of the former colonial masters. New leaders were brought to power using the Western capital, armies and intelligence organisations. This was clearly creation of a leadership that was not accountable to its people and at worst oppressed its electorate. These policies have continued to be used in the current era especially with the new scramble for African resources. This work discusses and analyses how Western powers created an African leadership that was answerable not to its people but to Western capitals and the capitalist world at the expense of its peoples as well as the way in which those who are perceived as threats to Western interest are dealt with. It will end by postulating a new theory for international relations in the Twenty first century as well as an analysis of the new concept of the 'International Community'.

Creatures and Creators

Colonialism created mythical boundaries for Africa. Boundary development in precolonial Africa has always been a fluid process in which different wars of

conquest changed the boundaries. Colonialism brought in new rigid boundaries that alienated tribes from each other and created new nations. At independence, most African countries accepted these boundaries and the European system of 'democratic governance'. However, this governance was not wholesome and in many cases it was a betrayal of those who struggled to get back what was rightly theirs.

The fear of losing what they had amassed through treachery in more than a century of colonial domination led European powers to give African independence at their own terms. They 'created' a new leadership for Africa which was seen and revered by the African as their own sons, yet answering to the calls of their own creators. This nature of events laid contradictory burdens on the new comprado leadership which needed to appease their peoples while also serving their European and American masters well. The contradictory nature meant that these 'prophets' sacrificed the peoples for the gods. Others, however, chose to disobey, like the biblical Lucifer or the Quraanic Jews who went to fishing on Sabbath. These African leaders became dissidents and had to meet their punishment while the pious ones got blessings. Yet even in that obedience, a time would come when the importance of a servant seizes and he/she becomes a liability. This is when the good servants are dumped, rested or given a secure retirement package.

To argue that the African leadership is a creation of the West is not to say that they are all impositions on their own peoples. It is claim that it would be tantamount to relegating the Africans who put every effort to have leaders of their choice into mere stooges. However, the argument is based on the fact that the system which Africans use today is either derived from the French, British or American style of democracy. Any product from this system becomes a Western creation by extension. Tafataona Mahoso notes that, "In a recent paper, Professor IssaShivji quoted Amilcar Cabral, Archie Mafeje and Frantz Fanon to demonstrate that African leaders must rise in a world and context where the ground has been undercut and paved over by imperialism"[1].Western leaders have also in many occasions managed to manipulate this system which is not as strong as the ones from which the idea was borrowed to impose leaders of their choice in Africaindirectly.

Sophisticated methods have been used to create and dismantle leaders in Africa and perpetuate the colonization of the African countries. These methods have been repeated in different countries at different times. They include engineering coups, use of armed intervention and the sponsoring of opposition and prospective puppets against incumbents who are viewed as failing to toe the neocolonial line. This was mostly made possible by compromising independence constitutions that were crafted to offer loopholes that could be later [and now being] manipulated to allow Western countries to intervene in the above stated ways and create as well as punish African leaders. While the discussion may be simplistic, the actual forces at place are very complicated as they include the use of intelligence organizations and experts to fulfil the goals. International media is also used to justify the cause of the intervention for both the home electorate as well as the nationals in the countries that these interventions are bound to take place.

The case of the assassination of one of the promising African leaders, Patrice Lumumba has been discussed by many political science scholars in Africa and the world at large. The Lumumba case clearly exposed European and American disregard for democracy and their quest for puppetry in Africa. Tafataona Mahoso points out clearly that, "Patrice Lumumba, the first popularly elected Prime Minister of Congo (now Democratic Republic of Congo), was almost a boy when the Belgians overthrew, tortured and murdered him with the help of the US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). Lumumba's administration did not even last a year. So age and length of time in office were not the reasons for regime change in Congo (DRC)"[2].

In southern Africa, just like in any other part of the continent, iconic leaders who rose up in the region serve well in the understanding of the way in which Western national interest played on the continental agenda. The most important leader to rise earlier was Samora Machel of Mozambique. From the outset, Machel proved that he was out for the destruction of the colonial state in Mozambique and also supported Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) and African National Congress (ANC), the liberation wings of Zimbabwe and South Africa respectively. His policies failed to ogre well with the designs of the imperialist and just like Lumumba, he fell to the assassination plots of the South African and US leadership. His desires for a stable and developed Mozambique were proved when he compromised his regional liberation ideals by signing the Nkomathi Pact.[3] Such compromises were never received well in both Pretoria and Washington and he also faced the same fate as that of Lumumba.

The case of Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe as another important Southern African Leader is an interesting one in international relations. In Zimbabwe, a national debate has sprung to try and understand the underhand of the Anglo Saxon world in its battle to rein in Robert Mugabe. While the Zimbabwean government went on a honeymoon with the former colonial masters in the early years of independence,[4] it can be argued that it failed to implement some of the liberation war promises due to the constraining and emasculating the Lancaster House Agreement. The government made some strides which failed to meet the demand for land redistribution as pressure mounted due to the implementation of the Economic Structural Adjustment Programme (ESAP).[5]

The former colonial masters failed to understand the calls of the Zimbabweans when Clair Short and her boss Tony Blair openly denied honouring the British colonial burdens and promises. In an inflammatory letter to KumbiraiKangai, Short wrote that,"I should make it clear that we do not accept that Britain has a special responsibility to meet the cost of land purchase in Zimbabwe. We are a new government from diverse backgrounds without links to former colonial interest. My own origins are Irish and as you know we were colonized, not colonizers"[6].

Faced with a defiant Britain and the electorate that was demanding their heritage right, the government acted in favour of the latter and this was the beginning of an open war between Mugabe and the Western countries. An international media

onslaught was launched against Mugabe and it attacked him from all angles ranging from his governing policies which were described as cronyism and dictatorial, the lengthy of his reign as too long and his age and health as old, tired and unhealthy to continue at the helm of the state.[7]

Mugabe has stayed in power for long. According to the constitution he can still continue to stay in power legally. What must be questioned are the double standards exhibited by the west in their vilification of the Zimbabwean president. The media onslaught was also brought home to legitimize the need to catapult MDC into power by any means through the private print media which also echoed and parroted the tune of the Western driven international media. The West has in many circumstances supported ailing leaders, undemocratic military juntas and some leaders who ruled for more than four decades like Bongo of Central African Republic.

While Mugabe preached the gospel of reconciliation in 1980, long before Mandela enjoyed public freedom and forgave Ian Smith, the leader of Rhodesia and his army chief, General Peter Walls without any Truth and Reconciliation Commission, his failure to continue to play to the Western tune saw him loosing the glamour to Nelson Mandela of South Africa. His real crime, against all the media would claim at least to the Western government is neither his disobedience to the democratic norms nor his age and tenure of office, but defiance to the calls of not giving land to the blacks and his new stand as the strong challenger of the neocolonial order. Even his challenge to George W. Bush in the United Nations (UN) General Assembly made him to be judged as mad. Mugabe's crimes were summarised by Stephen Gowans as:

> *Rejecting a proforeign investment economic restructuring program established by the IMF as a condition for balance of payment support (after initially accepting it), expropriating farms owned by the settlers of European origin as part of a program of land redistribution aimed at benefiting the historically disadvantaged African population and establishing foreign investment controls and other measures to increase black Zimbabwean ownership of the country's natural resources and enterprises.[8]*

Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act (ZIDERA) made it clear that proper dealings with Zimbabwe will come after the restoration of the land situations to its pre2000 status quo.[9] All these efforts are in a dire need to remove any leader who challenges the Western driven political status quo in Africa.

Mugabe is not a unique leader to such Judaslike dealings from the West. In 2011, Ghaddafi of Libya faced the same fate, through his hand bombs showering over his country and family under the guise of fulfilling a UN mandate to protect civilians whilst killing the same civilians.

The last Southern African iconic leader under discussion is Nelson Mandela of South Africa. This is the man who brought about the 'rainbow nation' in South Africa and preached the gospel which Mugabe had also preached, that of reconciliation and accepting your yesterenemy as your friend today and in the future. While the implementation of reconciliation was good for the coherence of the country, it was also a betrayal of the South African cause. The South African struggle can be seen as an aborted struggle by the leadership. This argument draws from the fact that the South African struggle had promises and aspirations which had to be met for the people to say that the blood, sweat and tears of the children have been honoured. The aspirations and promises of the struggles were summarised in the Freedom Charter as;

> *The national wealth of our country, the heritage of South Africans shall be restored to the people; the mineral wealth beneath the soil, the Banks and monopoly industry shall be transferred to the ownership of the people as a whole; all other industry and trade shall be controlled to assist the wellbeing of the people.[10]*

Naomi Klein notes that:

> *What the Freedom Charter asserted was the baseline consensus in the liberation movement that freedom would not come merely when blacks took control of the state but when the wealth of the land that had been illegitimately confiscated was reclaimed and redistributed to the society as a whole. South Africa could no longer be a country with Californian living standards for the whites and Congolese living standards for the blacks, as the country was described during the apartheid years; freedom meant that it would have to find something in the middle.[11]*

Those who had already benefited from the apartheid regime were promised safety of property acquired through the most institutionalised unscrupulous means. The new government and the former racist masters understood the need for an economic ownership dilution. A few blacks were granted the blessing of joining in the system on an unwritten condition of not changing the system. Naomi Klein notes that South Africa was granted a constricted freedom.[12] While there was the dismantling of political apartheid, there was no dismantling of economic apartheid and given the power of those who control the reins of the economy to control politics through the invisible hand, claiming that the South African can celebrate freedom without the fulfilment of the Freedom Charter is a mockery to those who sacrificed their lives for freedom.

Amilcar Cabral notes that as long as the chains of economic colonization are still limiting the freedom of the African, new governments should continue to drive for the liberation of the productive forces and ensure that the price paid by the peoples in different sacrifices is equally met.[13] It seems from a South African

perspective, such theories have been lost and the leadership has already taken a lengthy honeymoon with their former oppressors. It can be argued that for the South African, Mandela the revolutionary was stolen from the nation and more than 20 years of incarceration and reorientation made the Africans satisfied that the new Mandela they released in 1992 was only the body of Mandela with a 'Thatcherite soul'.[14] Thabo Mbeki had already been fully baptised in the neoliberal pond and became the new prophet of neoliberal policies in South Africa at independence. This became the demise of the Freedom Charter.

Mandela's acts have earned him accolades in Europe and the US and in a rare appearance of the former African leaders, his statue stands next to those of his former incarcerators in Parliament Square in London. Any African great leaders like Kwame Nkrumah, Samora Machel, Julius Nyerere and Patrice Lumumba have received such rewarding. While South Africa boasts of a stable macroeconomy, what we should ask is whose economy is stable in South Africa and what say the majority South Africans has on the stable economy. If the Europeans and the Americans had truly learnt a lesson from Mandela on reconciliation as they celebrate him having achieved, one would expect them to have extended such a hand of reconciliation to 'great tyrants' like Saddam Hussein and arguably Osama bin Laden. Their acts show that the rewards for the acclaimed reconciliation icon are not truly reconciliation but a thank you for the continuation of economic apartheid in one of the most influential economies in Africa.

The joining by African states at independence into international institutions in which they have little or no control in has also been manipulated into leashes that are used to control national development policies and ensure that they are always in line with the capitalist needs of the Western nations. From these organizations like the UN, World Trade Organization (WTO), International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank and the Bank of International Settlements, pseudothink tanks are sent to Africa to lecture on development planning and policies. Most of the policies they have prescribed are based on the failed neoliberal economics and governance. These policies which are based in the Washington Consensus have brought tremendous suffering to the Africans without the care of the Washington spindoctors. Neils S. C. Hahn argues that, "The 1980s Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) did deprive all at once many millions of people of their ordinary employment and means of subsistence, but this did not change the neoliberal discourse. Neoliberal thinking has become hegemonic and created a 'new normalcy' and 'common sense' among capitalist dominated societies and countries. Failed neoliberal policies are being replaced by other neoliberal policies defended in terms of 'logical' explanations and positive rhetoric such as 'voices of the poor', Poverty Reduction Strategies and 'participatory' frameworks"[15].

The SAPs that were brought to Africa were simply the repackaging of the Morgenthau Plan for the deindustrialization of Germany. The plan "had many features designed to keep the German people miserable. Besides limiting factory

production and in some cases ordering the dismantling of factories which had not been bombed, it "cut from underneath" the economic and financial underpinnings needed for largescale rebuilding projects."[16]

Germany was only served by the need to buttress the European economies and develop them into a bulwark against communism. The deal was later exported to Africa at the end of decolonization. Africa should remain an agricultural economy and a perpetual receiver of aid. Such policies help keep the leash of control in the neck of African leaders who will have to choose between suffering and loose the support of their peoples and hence rely on Western capitals for their stay in power or the wrath of underhand sabotage in different forms that will force their peoples to turn against them and open a vacuum to be filled by those who are ready to accept puppetry. Hence the IMF and World Bank should not be seen as institutions championing proAfrican policies, but as institutions meant to forward the policies of their creators.

The fact that the IMF and World Bank prescribed the SAPs to Africa basing them on the created fact that it was the SAPs like adjustment that had brought about the East Asian Miracle while it was the opposite proving that the institutions worked with hidden agendas. Trying to argue that the economists at the highest financial institutions got the wrong information about the facts would not do justice to their intellect. However, real politics compels that facts are twisted to achieve certain desired ends many times and that is precisely what these agents have been doing.

Blessings and Punishments

Politics of aid, recognition and other diplomatic supports are well known to be rooted in the politics of realism. The notion that aid is a philanthropic move by the developed countries to bridge the development gap is a myth in international relations. The notion that under the era of the triumph of liberal democracy, recognition of governments will be given, after adherence to international democratic norms is another political fallacy which is contradictory to historical facts.

Aid has been used for different political reasons in international politics which are more captured in the principles of international realism. The ways in which aid is given to the European countries under the Marshall plan is different from the aid which is given to Africa. While the Marshall Plan was meant to resuscitate European industries, aid to Africa is a way of keeping the continent in perpetual poverty and need. Even the Marshal Plan was not rooted in the US philanthropy. Rather, it is better understood from the notion that the US had developed to the extent that its industries could not be sustained by home consumption alone. The plan was a double benefit for the US. Loans given would definitely acquire interest while at the same time it brought back the European market to its feet for the survival of the US manufacturing sector. In Eastern Europe, the Marshal Plan extended not

on the pretext of philanthropy, but as a political tool to curb the spread of Russia communism that was a threat to the US dominance in the region.

In Africa, politics of aid and recognition as well as other diplomatic or bilateral supports are used as a way of supporting the 'allies' and punishing the "dissidents". While in the international Western media we are told that support by the Western powers is based on the adherence to democratic norms, on the ground, events prove otherwise. The relations of US with tyrannical regimes in the world from Musharraf's Pakistan to Mobutu's Zaire and Mubarak's Egypt are well known and documented. Tafataona Mahoso has also questioned that if the US was a friend of democrats, what problems did they would find with a diplomatic, Patrice Lumumba.[17] Lumumba, who was the first democratically elected Prime Minister of Congo (DRC), was removed from power by the Belgian and US machinations which included the employment of CIA agents to assassinate him with lethal poison.[18]

Yoweri Museveni also pointed out that the British support the dictatorship of Iddi Amin in Uganda with full knowledge that he was a tyrant who was feeding on the blood of his people.[19] In all these cases, adherence to the principles of democracy was never considered as long as the regimes supported in Africa and other regions like the Middle East played to the tunes of Western capitals. Other examples include the support given to Saddam Hussein, as well as the Saudi Arabian monarchy. It is from this notion that the current hype on the observance of democratic principles to gain support is questionable.

Mythical Gods

Since the beginning of colonialism, through the colonial period to the era of neo colonialism, Africans have been indoctrinated to believe that their mere existence is pinned to the existence of the developed Western world. Any attempt to revise the thinking is dealt with severely. Think of Kwame Nkrumah, Amilcar Cabral and Robert Mugabe. But the world is bigger than the Western countries. While they remain significant players, they have seized to be the playmakers. What stays today is the myth of the superpower doctrine. One can equate the current international scenario to the Greek gods, many in number, fighting for the love and fear of the people, yet not so powerful that the people whom they created could fight them and post some victories.

The cult of the mythical gods was created in the international system that was born at the end of the Second World War (WW II). The USA and the USSR, the new powers that emerged at the end of WW II had no significant colonial claims. They also wanted to benefit from colonial resources mostly from Africa. They therefore pushed for decolonization agenda which was not based on the equality of humanity

as claimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), but for them to claim their 'place on the sun'.

Independence was in most cases granted on stringent terms that were meant to grant political independence and continue with the most important economic control. Independence constitutions were drafted not by the indigenous peoples who had sacrificed life and wealth to gain it but by long distant masters in European capitals who had sacrificed something to keep indigenous peoples in chains. In the case of Zimbabwe, the Lancaster House Agreement was signed in London with a number of questionable clauses which included 20 seats reserved for whites, the willing buyer willing seller clause in relation to land which was buttressed by the protection of private property clause in the same document. In respect with South Africa, Naomi Klein notes that, "Unlike their counterparts in Mozambique, the National Party didn't pour concrete—their sabotage, equally crippling, was far subtler, and was all in the fine print of those historic negotiations."[20]

The very essence of colonialism was not merely to increase the land under the colonial empire for the sake of being large. Colonialism was a commercial adventure. It was influenced by the explosion of capitalism in Europe. Colonies were therefore needed for markets and to extract raw materials for the booming industries in Europe. Political control was only an assertion of the economic control and denying Africans' economic control of their countries was like giving a child asking for his peanut, regarding the peanut case with the nut having been removed. In his famous address to the Tricontinental Conference of the Peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, Amilcar Cabral pointed out that, "We have seen that violent usurpation of the freedom of the process of development of the productive forces of the dominated socioeconomic whole constitutes the principal and permanent characteristic of imperialist domination, whatever its form. We have also seen that this freedom alone can guarantee the normal development of the historical process of a people. We can therefore conclude that national liberation exists only when the national productive forces have been completely freed from every kind of foreign domination"[21].

The essence of the struggles was dismantled and a new leadership was produced for the Africans. In the case of South Africa, the most celebrated African president, Nelson Mandela, was revered as an international icon for his 'humanity'. However, in all the struggles to attract such international recognition, Mandela forgot the essence of the South African struggle, why the whites incarcerated him at Robin Island and other prisons he was housed and why many children had lost their lives for the independence. Mandela the revolutionary leaders was lost in Robin Island and the imperialist could laugh at the South Africans who celebrated the release of what they thought was Mandela when the soul had been lost due to many years of incarceration and mental reorientation.

Another way of creating a perpetual domination was the use of the International Financial Institutions (IFIs), mostly the IMF and the World Bank to

give Africans loans that created a cycle of debt and SAPs which in essence were simply the repackaging of the Morgenthau Plan for the deindustrialization of postwar Germany. The plan was meant to emasculate Germany and reduce it into and agricultural economy[22] that would not have the capacity of sponsoring another major war. The plan was also meant to create an export market for British and Belgian products. It was a complex plan and included the deindustrialization of Germany industries and discouraging the creation of new ones. It was noted that at its height the plan would cause tremendous suffering to the Germans and rampant poverty.[23]

European leaders and economists had always known that an agricultural economy cannot sustain itself, let alone a fast growing population like what took place in Africa since decolonization. Osei Boateng points out that, "America fought hard to emulate Britain and set up its own industries because they knew that whatever the initial productivity level, agriculture and the production of raw materials would soon run into diminishing returns. And, if there were no alternatives employment, these diminishing returns would eventually cause real wages to fall"[24].

With that knowledge, European and American leaders found a way to perpetuate the myth of them as all important leaders and touch bearers for Africans. The SAPs applied in every part of Africa had the same consequences including increased unemployment through retrenchments, increase in the cost of living due to devaluation, and the death or takeover of local industries by European investors due to unequal pressure from the products of the developed countries. The myth is also compounded by the redefinition of the term 'International Community' which implicitly is now used to refer to influential European countries.

International Relations: Another International Relations Theory

While many theories have been postulated to answer the nature of international affairs, they all have had deficiencies some of which can be answered by accepting that the world is now in a nature of realist Interdependence. This new theory postulates that while all states need each others' resources in a complex interdependent way, realism has not passed into oblivion, and states can do anything to acquire or control such resources. A number of examples can best answer some of these issues. The US's Bush administration invaded Saddam's Iraq in 2003 on the pretext of the nonexistent weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), the US Obama Administration, Cameroon's Britain and Sarkozy's France armtwisted the UNSC to have an illegal mandate to aid 'democratic rebels'[25], bombardment of Afghanistan under the pretext of looking for Osama Bin Laden who was later reported to have been killed in Pakistan. In all the cases, strategic resources were at the centre of the conflicts. Hence, it is interdependence of resources acquired in the most sophisticated barbaric manners.

Under the realist Interdependence, It is contended that while a lot has changed since the end of the Second World War, Western powers have not changed in how they operate politically and are still influenced by the philosophies of scholars like

Machiavelli and Clausewitz that peace is achieved through amassing weapons that are enough to deter and break your enemies. Added to this thinking were lessons taught by leaders like Lord Palmerstone about not having permanent friends or enemies but permanent interests, and George Washington that America should not be entangled in permanent European allies.[26] Jules Henry points out that, "It is clear that in preparation for modern war an interdependent world political economy has within it sufficient conflicts of interest to make all nations potential enemies to all others"[27].

The thesis is influenced by the fact that strategic resources reserve in the global world especially oil are dwindling[28] while consumption is increasing unprecedentedly. Lesser powers who have been scared by the behaviour of the US, France, Britain and to a lesser extend Russia have started to boost up their arms arsenals, and the peoples of developing world are claiming a greater share of their resources and denying the neoliberal thought which they view as a defacto secession of their resources to the rich West and the rise of international terrorism which has made relations between countries sour and uneasy, and also the unfettered desires by the Western countries to maintain international hegemony.

The Western countries have in the years sought for alternative power sources to oil in vein. The Bush administration and its successor, the Obama administration in the USA have also talked of looking for other oil reserves in the gulf of Mexico which have been thwarted by the expensive nature of under sea oil drilling and the environmental catastrophes that may follow if such drilling is not managed properly as evidenced by the BP crisis of 2010. This has made the American governments to reconsider the projects, hence lead a return to a reliance on Middle East oil. Indeed the reliance and importance of the Middle East to the healthy survival of the US as a global power was declared by Jimmy Carter when he pointed out that;

> Let our position be absolutely clear: An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force. During the past three years, you have joined with me to improve our own security and the prospects for peace, not only in the vital oilproducing area of the Persian Gulf region but around the world. We've increased annually our real commitment for defense, and we will sustain this increase of effort throughout the FiveYear Defense Program. It's imperative that Congress approve this strong defense budget for 1981, encompassing a five percent real growth in authorizations, without any reduction.[29]

While Carter was explicit on the Persian Gulf, his successors have expanded the US area of influence to encompass the rest of the oil producing countries. Airforce magazine notes that, "His pledge was instantly dubbed 'the Carter Doctrine,' and it has persisted under his successors"[30].

The rise of the newly İndustrializing countries in East Asia and the BRICS

countries has made the European powers to reopen the books of realist thinking and come to terms with politics of realism in a world that is largely interdependent. China has moved into Africa with a different policy to that of the Western push and control policy which is guided by the big brother hangover. This has seen China achieving some diplomatic and economical successes ahead of the Western countries. The US has therefore devised other methods to regain the control not only in Africa but also in other countries outside the continent. AFRICOM is one of these realist strategies meant to regain influence in the continent.

It is imperative at this juncture to explain the different assumptions that underline the integrated theory of realist interdependence in depth and what they entail for the world in the 21st century. The global dwindling of oil reserves and new oil reserves discoveries in Africa has led to the new scramble for Africa. OPEC oil plays an important role as it props the US dollar since the break of the Gold Standard in 1971.[31]CoilinNunan notes that:

> While the denomination of oil sales is not a subject which is frequently discussed in the media, its importance is certainly well understood by governments. For example, when in 1971 President Nixon took the US off the gold standard, OPEC did consider moving away from dollar oil pricing, as dollars no longer had the guaranteed value they once did. The US response was to do various secret deals with Saudi Arabia in the 1970s to ensure that the world's most important oil exporter stuck with the dollar. What the Saudis did, OPEC followed.[32]

The more discoveries of oil in Africa and the dwindling of Middle East reserves is a clear sign that the matrix of power in OPEC may shift from the Middle East to being shared or tipped in the favor of Africa. Given this possibility, the US is fast trying to get control of African oil producing states. This is one way in which the Libyan crisis should be understood. The nationalistic and independence stance of Muammar Ghaddafi could not be countenanced with as it was a threat to the US global hegemony.

The Chinese move into Africa especially in countries like Angola which has already surpassed Nigeria as the largest petroleum producer in Africa has sent a chill in the American spines. It is not surprising that the US now is in dire need to have an African Command brigade stationed in Africa in the name of AFRICOM, a region which it isolated for decades as unworthy of investments choosing the Middle and Far East instead.[33] Africa has therefore become an important arena of realist politics in the current century.

Other so called 'unstable countries' have been investing in military technology. While it is an international debate on what constitutes an unstable country, it is clear that these countries are reacting to the motions of history. Topical among these countries is North Korea and Iran. The Iranian government has in recent years clashed with the EU and USA over its nuclear ambitions. While Iran has

refused to have any designs for a nuclear bomb, experts in the weapons technology field assert that some of the missiles which have been tested by Iran can be launched carrying nuclear warheads.[34]

The decisions to talk with Iran or bribe it into not getting the bomb has been seen as self defeating as Iran has been emboldened by the threats posed to its security by nuclear armed Israel and the invasion of Iraq. The invasion of Iraq exposed Iran as the next US target. American designs in the strategically important Gulf region have led many Middle East countries to be cynical about its operations in the region. The talk of US invading Iran have been on the table for a lengthy time and the most appropriate way of Iran to defend itself it to lay a claim on the deterrent power of nuclear weapons and threaten the US into attacking Israel in any event of the US invading Iran. The threat can be applied to attacking US allies and strategic pipelines in the region.

Another element which has seen the world being taken to the realities of realist politics in the Twenty first century has to do with international terrorism. It is difficult to come up with a political definition of terrorism in international politics. Terrorism has become a term the ordinary person in the street take for granted. We have been cultured to believe that terrorism is what the USA and Western Europe tell us about and the international community turn a blind eye mostly when there is state terrorism.

Terrorism is both a reality and a fantasy that is used mostly by the Western governments to go on international adventures on the pretext of fighting terror. There is also state terrorism which is mostly used by powerful states to control the smaller states. In all these cases, terrorism has become an influential phenomenon that has been shaping the international policies of states even in Africa.

A number of countries have been pointing fingers at each other as sponsors of terrorism. Iran has accused the US of sponsoring terrorist groups in Iran[35] while the US claims that Iran is among the sponsors of terrorism both in the Middle East and the world in general.[36] The NATO camp has been using the concept of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction to create imaginary enemies that are used to endorse wars of expansion and imperialism.

International relations in the Twenty first century has seen power and interest being fused. Power is used by the powerful states to maintain their influence in international affairs. The role of France in Ivory Coast and the justification and the use of force to drive Ghaddafi out of power in Libya show the world that the world is now in a 'civilized anarchical' era. The legitimizing of rebels, arming them and coining them to be democratic inorder to justify the use of force is a clear sign that democracy will never be a yardstick for the west to grant recognition to any state.

While the revolutions in Tunisia and Egypt gained legitimacy by their peaceful

and home grown nature, that of Libya still suffers from the crisis of legitimacy. It is possible for one to claim that what is happening is not a Libyan revolution but a Benghazi insurrection against the Libyan government. The legitimacy which it has got does not derive from the desire of the Libyans to oust Ghaddafi, even though they may wish to do by other means, from the support and premature recognition by the US and the European countries that had always wished to see the Libyan leader out of power.

It is also questionable that the leaders of sovereign countries would command another president to leave office when he/she will be battling to nip a rebellion. The NATO involvement in Libya inorder to oust the legitimate president is plainly usurping the democratic right of the Libyans to determine their future and choose their sovereign leaders. This proves that traditional politics of the dominance of mighty is still strong in the current epoch. It is also imperative to point out that the revolutions that have been taking place are not exclusive to Africa, but to several countries across the world. One of the bloodiest revolution places in Thailand, pitting the government forces against the Red Shirts and the Yellow Shirts also taking part in the skirmishes: yet, the international communities remained silent to calls of the leadership change.[37]

While there have been upheavals, the world has also known peace as in any period in international politics.As well as their animosity have remained high. The capture of Russian spies in the US[38] and the diplomatic raw between the US and China over the US arms sale to Taiwan[39] prove that cooperation and animosity will exist side by side in the era of realist interdependence.

Hüseyin Işıksal points out complex interdependence arguing:

> *The military power of strong states would not be that much influential in the post Cold War Era since military force would not be necessarily effective on pursing neither economic nor political interests of the states. By this way, states have to consider the institutions, nonterritorial actors, along with multidimensional and multinatural threats rather than and the state itself.[40]*

This is a fallacy that was created by the euphoria in the triumph of Liberal Democracy over Communism as an international ideology. Yet, the statement is not all thoroughly true. Indeed, other threats to national security have risen and international organizations have multiplied to challenge the state, but the state has remained the most dominant actor that sets the agenda for other international organizations. In many countries, mostly the Western, one's defense budgets have remained high above other celebrated new and important concepts. The US defence budget has stood above US$ 650 billion since 2010[41]. This happened while the rhetoric of the need to transfer resources to important aspects like social welfare, education and health have been going on in the corridors of powers across the world.

International Community: Which Community?

The development of the world has seen the development of an 'international community' which is vaguely defined. While many take the term for granted, international events at the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the twenty first century make it imperative for the questioning of the inclusiveness of the term 'international community.' The Western powers have redefined the meaning of the term to mean a few selected countries within their sphere of influence. The redefinition of the term is coined in the crises beginning in Iraq to Iran and has also been mentioned in the Ivorian and Libyan crises.

What Should Be International Community?

The term international community is a development from the changes taking place due to globalization. The concept has been developed in the changes taking place in international law in international relations. It seeks to legitimize international institutions like the International Court of Justice (ICJ), International Criminal Court (ICC) and the UN among others. It is a concept that permits the gathering of states in the creation and maintenance of international institutions and a universal international law. It can also be viewed as a concept that seeks to justify international intervention in local disputes for the sake of the common good.

The notion of an international community should accept all humans. Be that as it may, the embryonic stages of the international community were the getting together of states in an international based system of rules of interaction, cooperation and war. Trying to reduce it to the claim that the international community began with the coming together of European states at the Peace of Westphalia (1648) will be to limit the history of the world to European history. Precolonial African states had rules that governed their interactions in matters of trade and war.[42] The same can be said for the Arabian states that were remote to the Europeans but rich in their development of international law and the laws of treaties.[43]

After the end of WW II there were rapid developments in international law and the creation of international institutions. If the international community is to be described as the coalescing together of all of the states and nations in the world, it could be dated back to the creation of the UN as an incomplete international body but having room to welcome other members in the international community of states.

Tony Blair in 1999 argued that;

> *We are witnessing the beginning of a new doctrine of international community. By this I mean the explicit recognition that today more than ever before, we are mutually dependent, that national interest is to a significant extent governed by international collaboration and that we need a clear coherent debate as to the direction this doctrine takes us in each field of international endeavour. Just as within domestic politics, the notion of community – the belief that partnership and cooperation are essential to advance selfinterest – is coming into its own; so it needs to find its international echo.[44]*

The acceptance of the world having reached the stage of claiming to be an international community cannot be refuted. However, there are still missing links in the issue. Today's international community has not yet evolved into an international community of individuals but rather of states which still promulgate and accept rules of interaction of both states and individuals. Individual state governments with diverging and converging interests are still to prevail until the unforeseeable future. While there is deepened interaction between states and individuals from various states, from the East to West separation is still rife. The international community is therefore one of a limited nature. It is not the one that looks like having a single government and universal rule and laws, those against it as dissidents fighting a legitimate international order.

International issues related to war, climate change and international law should not be ignored. The best platform for their discussion is through the international organisations like the UN, AU, EU, ASEAN and the Arab League. Any attempts to divert from this international order will lead into the fears of the current century, the return to unilateralism and plunging the world in an explicitly anarchical environment.

Blair's version of the international community is blind of other international facts which his country later proved. While partnership and cooperation are the ideals for an international community, the west has proven that playing to the rules will only be a doctrine to be followed when the rules are in support of their actions. Where the rules take a different course, in the Western doctrine of international law, such rules can be substituted for free will, with international conventions and UN resolutions arm twisted to suit their desires. One would be tempted to question the role of the US in supporting the ICC and other international criminal tribunals when it shied away from joining the ICC while it flexed its muscles as the human rights watchdog of the international community.

The behaviour by the powerful countries in the international community proves that the international community has an inner circle and an outer layer which is only the receiver but not an important player in shaping the course the events in the international community.

Exclusive Nature of the 'International Community'

The new definition of the international community seems to exclude most important world citizens for the benefit of the few who have the Anglo American blessings of being anointed. In analysing the new international dispensation, Reason Wafawarowa notes that the current world has now "worthy thugs and an unworthy victims"[45]. The fact that it has only been Washington and Brussels that have been using the threat of isolating countries from the 'International Community' proves that the term has taken a different meaning than it should carry in international relations. In other words, the USA and the EU have monopolized the 'International Community'.

While many conflicts have been erupting in the world, only countries that take a route that contradicts the Western policies are threatened with exclusion from the international community. This exclusion, while in real terms is supposed to mean lack of support from the majority of the UN members in general and the regional countries of that particular country, it has now been made to mean cutting off of diplomatic ties and cooperation with the EU and North America.

A look at world events shows that mostly it has been Iraq, Iran, North Korea, Zimbabwe and other countries that have been unfriendly to the West have been threatened with an isolation from the international community. In many instances, these countries would be having progressive relations with regional and other growing international powers in international relations. While Iran was threatened with isolation and slammed with sanctions from the 'International Community', it enjoyed cordial relations with other regional countries in the Middle East as well as Brazil and Venezuela which led to the signing of a nuclear deal in may 2010. Zimbabwe has also enjoyed progressive diplomatic relations with powers like China, Russia, Venezuela as well as the majority of African countries, but it was isolated from the 'International Community'.

The current definition of an international community from the West is reminiscent of the definition of the world in the colonial times when the world was Europe and the colonized people were regarded as subhumans at best. The international structures that run international relations were created on the foundations of these notions and have continued upto the current times perpetuating the colonial mentality. Kofi Annan noted these facts in his farewell address in the US when he argued that:

> *In fact, it is only through multilateral institutions that states can hold each other to account. And that makes it very important to organise those institutions in a fair and democratic way, giving the poor and the weak some influence over the actions of the rich and the strong. That applies particularly in the international financial institutions, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. ... And it also applies to the UN Security Council, whose membership still reflects the reality of 1945, not of today's world.[46]*

To be accepted in the international community means being accepted by the Western powers even without a correspondence acceptance from regional states and other smaller nations. Hence, the people of Palestine can live under illegal Israeli colonization without it being kicked out of the 'international community' for gross human rights violations. Such events led the Iranian President, Mahmood Ahmadnejad to lament in his address to the 61st UN General Assembly that, "The prevailing order of contemporary global interactions is such that certain powers equate themselves with the international community, and consider their decisions superseding that of over 180 countries. They consider themselves the masters and rulers of the entire world and other nations as only second class in the world order"[47].

This notion of a Western defined international community was epitomized in the Bush Doctrine under the topic of a crusade against terror. The challenge by Bush that if the world did not want to join the US in the wars, it would go for it alone and that those who were not with the US were against it was a violation of the rights of other states to neutrality in conflicts they saw as not necessary for them to take sides.

The US military adventure in Iraq has failed to meet the standards of being a legal or just war. The war claimed innocent civilians whose lives has never been accounted for. Without a UN mandate to invade Iraq and with the propaganda of WMDs having been proven false by all standards, not even the rhetoric of the Saddam regime's support of terrorism can cover up for Bush's illegal war in Iraq. But even with such rogue practices in the international community, the US was never threatened with isolation from the community and still remains a pacesetter.

Mr Bush still walks free of charge. Yet the case has been different with the leaders of lesser states. The Sudanese and Libyan crises quickly drew the attention of both the UN and ICC to take stiff actions against the monstrous leadership devouring its people. While impunity cannot be justified, the case in Libya was a civil war which warranted the military intervention of the state. Rebels cannot be repelled by a government that stays in its shell. Libya should be seen as bigger than Benghazi and granting recognition to rebels is against the rules of any international convention including the UN Charter. In Sudan, the beginning of the conflict saw the rebels attacking weak government military outpost and arming themselves to fight as rebels and not demonstrators. Truly such acts cannot be taken as peaceful demonstrations. The questions which should be forwarded include why the ICC has failed to take tough measures against the rebels in both Sudan and Libya inorder

for them to account for their actions. The role of the West in the observation of international law and nurturing of the international community is marred by double standards and hypocrisy. While the US and the EU have preached democracy and self determination, they have supported and propped up rebel groups and undemocratic governments like those in Benghazi and the Saudi Monarchy.

The self anointed preachers of democracy have failed to support legitimate governments and have chosen to support those rebellious elements that have accepted or showed willingness to accept the extension of Western interests in their territories. One can therefore conclude that the concept of the international community from a Western perspective is one that only accepts those who do not question the status quo set by the Western powers and will work to derail any efforts by those who are willing to change it for total inclusion or for a cause that is against the Western standards.

Conclusion

The rise of independent African states did not translate into the removal of the Western economic noose on the necks of the Africans. The rise of political independence saw an intensification of economic colonialism in the most sophisticated manner. The nationalist leadership forgot or chose to ignore the quest of the struggles, betrayed the wishes of the masses that backed them to attain independence and went on a honeymoon with the former colonial masters.

African leaders who chose not to walk the path that had been cleared by the erstwhile colonial masters were eliminated or fought through all channels including diplomatic, economic and outright war. While the paper only mentions three leaders, namely Mugabe, Machel and Lumumba, many others before them faced the same enemy and were destroyed due to their quest for the total emancipation of the people they led. Such leaders include among others, Kwame Nkrumah and Amilcar Cabral. This was done without considering their democratic credentials. Western leaders only regarded the role of them or the threat thereof to the national interest of their countries.

On the other hand, those African leaders that chose to accept the dictates from Western capitals got the blessings and anointment as the best leaders in the world. They ware portrayed in the mainstream global media as the best leaders Africa has ever had. Those who have got such blessings when they get to the excesses are only discredited and dumped in the last phases of their terms. No democratic credentials are considered as well. The talk of democracy is only a weapon to be used against those who stand as bulwarks against the fulfilment of Western interests.

The paper ends by looking at the concept of the international community. It argues that while the concept of the international community is real and the era is now, the Western definition of the international community by the West is exclusionary.

Washington and Brussels regard themselves as the chief priests of the international community that can anoint whomever they wish and excommunicate those whom they regard as rogue elements. Such a view redefines the world as being Europe and the West and has the propensity of increasing, rather than reducing international tensions between the In and Out elements of the international community.

NOTES

1   Tafataona Mahoso, "Flush White Disk From African Memory" *The Sunday Mail*, May 29-June 4, 2011, D2.
2   "War Against Racist Myths of Democracy," Tafataona Mahoso, http://www.zimpapers.zw(accessed May 15, 2011)
3   Robert Davies, "South African Strategy towards Mozambique in the Post-Nkomati Period: A critical Analysis of Effects and Implications,"*Research Report,*No. 73, (Uppsala, the Scandinavian Institute of African studies, 1985), 17.
4   Clair Short's letter to KumbiraiKangai, *New African; Zimbabwe Special Issue*, Winter, 2007/08, 5.
5   Sam Moyo, *Land Reform under Structural Adjustment in Zimbabwe: Land Use Change in the Mashonaland Provinces,* (Stockholm: ElanderGotab, 2002), 11-13.
6   Clair Short, *New African*, Winter, 2007/08, 17
7   "Is Mugabe Fit For another Term?" Reagan Mashavave, , http://www.dailynews.co.zw/index.php/news/34-news/1913-is-mugabe-fit-for-another-term.html(accessed March 18, 2011)
8   "Understanding the Crisis in Zimbabwe: Cynicism as a substitute for scholarship," Stephen Gowan, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php(accessed April 11, 2011)
9   " Understanding the Crisis in Zimbabwe: Cynicism as a substitute for scholarship"
10   "Democracy born in Chains: South Africa's Constricted Freedom," Naomi Klein, accessed, February 22, 2011, http://www.naomiklein.org/articles
11   "Democracy born in Chains: South Africa's Constricted Freedom"
12   "Democracy born in Chains: South Africa's Constricted Freedom"
13   Amilcar Cabral, "the Weapon of theory", (address to the first Tricontinental Conference of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, January, 1966), , http://www.blackpast.org(accessed February 22, 2011)
14   "Democracy born in Chains: South Africa's Constricted Freedom"
15   S. C. Neils, "Neoliberal Imperialism and Pan-African Resistance," *Journal of World Systems Research* Xiii (2008): 144.
16   "The Morgenthau Plan in the Holocaust Myth," Dean Hierbud, , http://www.nemw.net/articles/2011feb/theMorgenthauPlanintheHolocaustmyth.pdf(accessed August 3, 2011)
17   "War Against Racist Myths of Democracy," Tafataona Mahoso, , http://www.zimpapers.zw(accessed May 15, 2011)
18   Cameroon Doudu, "Patrice Lumumba: From a Mere Man to a Lasting Symbol (2)," *New African*, May, 2011, 83.
19   YoweriMuseveni, "It's Not For Foreigners to Sponsor Rebels in Libya," *New African*, May, 2011, 22.
20   "Democracy born in Chains: South Africa's Constricted Freedom"
21   "The Weapon of Theory"
22   "The Morgenthau Plan for deliberate deindustrialization and starvation of Germany. Especially: document JCS 1067," Robert Faurisson, ,http://robertfaurisson.blogspot.com/2011/01/morgenthau-plan-for-deliberate.html(accessed August 4, 2011)
23   "The Morgenthau Plan for deliberate deindustrialization and starvation of Germany. Especially: document JCS 1067**"**
24   Osei Boateng, "Cracking the Code: Unlocking Africa's Secret to Wealth," *New African*, April, 2011, 17.

25 "Libya: Distractions and Diversions: 'The Rebels' Become the West's 'Democratic' Touch-Bearers," William Bowles, , http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php(accessed August 3, 2011)

26 L. K. Johnson and K. Caruson, "The Seven Sins of American Foreign Policy," *Political Science and Politics* xxxvi, (January 2003): 7

27 Femi Akomolafe, "Kissing Him Today, Raining bombs on Him Tomorrow," *New African,* May, 2011, 31.

28 US Government Accountability Office (GAO), "Crude Oil: Uncertainty About Future Oil Supply Makes it Important to Develop a Strategy for Addressing a Peak and Decline in Oil Production,"(Report to CongressGAO-07-283, February 2007), 2.

29 James E. Carter Jr., "The Carter Doctrine," (Address at Joint Session of Congress, The Capitol, Washington DC, January 23, 1980) *Airforce Magazine*; 93, (1980), http://www.airforce-magazine.com(accessed June 9, 2010)

30 "The Carter Doctrine"

31 "The War to Save the US Dollar," Gavin R. Putland, www.trinicenter.com/oops/iraqeuro.html(accessed August 24, 2010)

32 "Petrodollar or Petroeuro? A New Source of Global Conflict," CoilinNunan, accessed August 4, 2011, http://www.feasta.org/documents/review2/index.htm

33 BaffourAnkomah, "All Issues Great and Small," *New African*, November, 2010, 13.

34 AlirezaJafarzadeh, "Iran Building Nuclear Capable Missiles in Underground Secret Tunnels (SPC)," (paper presented to the National Press Club, Washington D. C., November 21, 2005).

35 "US Backing Terrorists: Iran," ABC News, , http://www.abc.com.au/news/stories/2007/10/29/2072649.htm?section=world(accessed August 2, 2011)

36 James N. Miller, Christine Parthemore, Kurt M. Campbell; "Game-Changing diplomacy: A new American approach to Iran," in Iran: Assessing US Strategic Options, ed. James N. Miller, Christine Parthemore, Kurt M. Campbell, (New York, Centre for new American security, 2008),8-9.

37 Giles JiUngpakorn, "Class Struggle Between the Coloured T-Shirts in Thailand," *Journal of Asia Pacific Studies* "No. 1" (2009): 76.

38   "Feds Bust 10 Alleged Russian Spies in US," http://www.foxnews.com/us/index.html(accessed August 3, 2011)

39 Bonnie Glaser and David Szerlip, "US-China Relations: The Honeymoon Ends," *Comparative Connections*, (April, 2010), 2.

40 HuseyinIsiksal, "To What Extend Complex Interdependence Theorists Challenge to Structural Realist School of International Relations?"*Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations* 3(Summer & Fall 2004), 142.

41 "Fiscal year 2012 Budget Request," United States Department of Defense, , www.comptroller.defense.gov(accessed August 3, 2011)

42 AdetolaOdubajo, *Introduction to International Law and Diplomacy in Pre-Colonial Africa*, (Lagos, National Open university of Nigeria, 2006), 44

43 "A Short History of International Law," Stephen C Neff, , http://www.oup.com/uk/orc/bin/9780199565665/evans3e_cho.pdf(accessed August 3, 2011)

44 Dino Kritsiotis, "Imagining the International Community" *English Journal of International Law* "No. 13" (2002): 969

45 "Worthy Thugs and Unworthy Victims," Reason Wafawarova, , http://www.rwafawarova.com/content/worthy-thugs-and-unworthy-victims(accessed August 3, 2011)

46 Kofi Annan, "All States Must Play by the Rules," (Final address at Truman Museum and Library in Independence, Missouri, December 11, 2006).

47 MahmoodAhmadnejad, (Address to the 61st UN General Assembly, New York, September 19, 2006).